WILSHIRE'S

Vol. XVII No. 11 LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1913 Price 2 Cents

Kautsky on the Present Position of German Socialism

KARL KAUTSKY admittedly holds both the premier place as the economist of the International Socialist movement and as the especial diagnostician of the condition of German Socialism. In recognition of this the *New Review*, a very excellent Socialist weekly review that appeared in New York for the first time last month, places him first on its list of contributors to its initial issue.

Kautsky, it may be added, is one of those still faithful to the old-time political-method-Socialism, and if he cannot say very much for it, then there is no one who can. He starts out by warning us that we must not expect anything to come now from the German Socialist movement merely because it polled 4,250,000 votes. Mere votes are nothing unless they elect an actual *majority* to the Reichstag. This is a little different from the popular theory of a big Socialist minority vote scaring the capitalists into passing Opportunist measures to prevent the minority becoming a majority. The German bourgeoisie do not seem to scare worth mentioning. We doubt if the English plutocracy would scare more. Kautsky writes:—

The election of 110 Social-Democratic deputies has altered nothing. The Government and the majority of the Reichstag are just as reactionary as before, social reform lags as it formerly did, and the rivalry in armaments goes merrily forward.

But those who expected that the elections could and would make any change in these respects were pinning their faith to unrealisable illusions. No bourgeois majority, no matter what its composition may be, will ever conduct an energetic struggle against the Government in behalf of a genuine Parliamentary régime, against militarism and for radical social reforms. Such a struggle can to-day be expected of a Social-Democratic majority only.

Since the beginning of the present century, Imperialism has taken possession of all bourgeois social strata in Germany. Radicals and followers of the Centre have begun to dream of colonial expansion and naval power, just like the National Liberals and Conservatives.

We have accomplished everything which, in the present situation, it is possible to accomplish by Parliamentary means.

Nowadays, it is impossible to make up a Reichstag, or any Parliament, *in any country*, in such a way as to make it capable of effecting great social and democratic reforms in the *absence of violent pressure from without*, unless the majority is composed of Socialists. The proletariat can no longer expect anything from any bourgeois party. A Parliament to-day can of itself create anything great only if it has a Social-Democratic *majority*.

This Reichstag is powerless to accomplish anything great, as is every Parliament with a bourgeois majority in a country with developed capitalistic production.

The high cost of living continues to rise. Class antagonisms are becoming ever more acute, the mass of the population is becoming more and more embittered against existing conditions. And we are making gigantic strides toward the time when we shall have half of the votes cast, and shortly after that half of the seats in the Reichstag.

But, it is true, *the nearer we approach this condition of affairs, so much the nearer do we come to the last, the hardest and most violent struggles*, for just so much the more bitter will be the resistance of our opponents.

It will be seen Kautsky takes exactly the same position the Syndicalists take, namely, that until the Socialists get an actual *majority* they can do nothing at all, and that before we get this majority "we come to the hardest and most violent struggles." It will be noted he fails to say exactly what sort of a violent struggle it is going to be, and that he also fails to say how he expects us to meet it. It is also to be noted that Kautsky quite endorses Syndicalism at another point.

He says: "Nowadays, it is impossible to make up a Reichstag or a Parliament in any country capable of effecting great reforms, in the absence of pressure from without, unless the majority is of Socialists." Exactly so, and he might have added that the only possible "pressure from without" is to come from Revolutionary Unionism.

Kautsky, it seems to us, gives away the whole Parliamentary position in this article. He admits that until the Socialists get a majority no reforms are possible, except owing to "pressure from without," no matter how large the Socialist minority may be. He admits that prior to getting this necessary majority there is to be a "violent struggle," and yet he gives no inkling as to how the workers are to arm themselves for such a struggle. Syndicalism will not only afford the "pressure from without," but also arm the workers with power for "violent struggles." Economic Solidarity is the Touchstone to Power.

The Vile U.S. Post Office

ANY newspaper or periodical, business, or man or woman, can be deprived of the "privilege" of the use of the mails, without a hearing of their own defence, on secret charges made by enemies to secret spies, and without the right of a hearing in any American court. Do you think this a right power to give *any* public servant or department of this Government?

Have you any idea that it will be used solely for the protection and good of the people? Those who have dared to publicly protest have brought on themselves the full malice and assault of such powers. Seldom have they escaped with their property, health or even their lives.

To dare to protest against these conditions, and the certain rapid loss of all true liberty and personal freedom, is to as certainly set in quick motion the powerful agencies of suppression, ruin and silence, vested in the hands of federal bureaux through a vast national spy system, secret indictment by federal grand juries at the behest of federal officials, followed by certain ruin, the confiscation of all property and resources, federal receiverships, fraud orders, the deprivation of the second-class privilege, and if possible to drive the protestor to suicide. The citizen who incurs the malice of a petty public servant in federal employ has, as has been aptly stated, "about as much chance as a tallow-legged rabbit chased through hell by an asbestos dog."—E. G. Lewis, in *Woman's National Weekly*, St. Louis.

The Social Significance of Arturo Giovannitti

Leonard D. Abbott, in *Current Opinion,* New York

OF all the men in this country thrown up into public view by the seething, bubbling social discontent of the twentieth century, none is more interesting than Arturo Giovannitti, the young Italian who, with Joseph Ettor, was acquitted a few weeks ago of murder in connection with the Lawrence strikes. He is not the usual type of Labour agitator. The usual type is not a very complex one. Given a rough experience in the school of hard knocks, a close acquaintance with the struggles of the poor to keep a little ahead of starvation, one fixed idea such as the Socialist implant with their gospel of the class war, a certain or uncertain amount of book-education and a considerable degree of dynamic power and natural courage, and the Labour leader is in most cases fairly well accounted for. But in Giovannitti there is something else. He has the soul of a great poet, the fervour of a prophet, and, added to these, the courage and power of initiative that mark the man of action and the organiser of great crusades.

He is but twenty-eight, and he has been in this country but twelve years. Near the close of his trial he made before the court the first speech he has ever made in the English language. It held all hearers spellbound. "In twenty years of reporting," said a veteran reporter afterwards, "I have never heard the equal of that speech." Slender, pale, trembling, his voice vibrant with emotion, his eyes welling with tears, "courteous always rather than assertive," he began as follows : "So solemn is this moment, so full with clashing emotions am I now, that I do not know whether I ever will conclude what I have to say." For twenty minutes he "spoke like one in the crisis of passion," and a long hush followed his conclusion, broken by the sobs of men as well as women. Some of the reporters were busier choking down their feelings than making copy, but they have given us an apparently literal report of the peroration :—

"I have a wife who loves me, a mother who loves me, an ideal that I love. Life is so wonderful. I feel the passion of living. It is sweet to live. I do not want to die, to go away as a martyr. Though life is dear to me, there is something holier and grander ; that is my conscience and loyalty to my comrades and my cause. If you say that we shall live, I want to say that in the next strike that breaks out in the country where we are needed, there will Joe Ettor and myself go. We will go our humble way, soldiers in the mighty army of workers of the world. If it be that our hearts must be stilled in the same electric chair as wife murderers and homicides ; if our hearts be that black, you think—then to-morrow we will pass into a greater judgment, into the presence of the Almighty, and history will give its last word to us."

Giovannitti was never accused of committing murder himself. It was held that he and Ettor uttered inflammatory speeches, the effect of which was a riot, in which an Italian woman was shot and killed. He steadily denied ever having favoured violence. All his speeches during the strike were in Italian, and but one sentence was testified to—by two private detectives, who said they had lost their notes—that seemed to counsel the use of physical force. This sentence Giovannitti positively denied having uttered, and the jury evidently believed him. But it is certain that he is one of the leaders of the most radical organisation—the Industrial Workers of the World—that has grown out of the Labour movement. His utterances ring with defiance of the whole "capitalist class," and if he fails to urge his followers to use force, it is probably because he considers the use of force to be as yet inexpedient.

Giovannitti is a social portent, all the more so because he is far removed from the criminal type. He has come to his present extreme views by way of the pulpit and the work of a Christian missionary. He was born in Campobasso, a city of thirty or forty thousand inhabitants in the province of Abruzzi, Italy. His father is a physician and a doctor of chemistry. One of his brothers is a physician and another a lawyer. The social standing of the family is good, and they remain loyal to the son who is in this country. Arturo himself received a fair degree of education in the public schools and lycées of that country. Before he was twenty he came to the new world, going first to Canada. For a time he wielded a pick in a coal mine in the Dominion, and it was there probably that the seeds of his resentment against the industrialism of to-day were planted. Our coal mines seem to have planted many such seeds. While he was studying the English language in Montreal, a Presbyterian minister there, in charge of an Italian mission, died, and Giovannitti was asked to take his place. For months he conducted the mission, and, evidently choosing the ministry as a career, he began to attend a Presbyterian theological school. In 1904, being then twenty years of age, he received a call to Brooklyn to take charge of a Presbyterian mission there. "I was not exactly a minister," he explains, "but a sort of missionary. I preached to the people on Sundays and taught them during the week." Still bent on entering the regular ministry, he entered the Union Theological Seminary and also registered at Columbia University. But the course of study of a theological school does not seem to have suited the tropical nature of this dreamer and poet. He stalled at the study of Hebrew. It was, he modestly observes, "a little too strong for my capacities." A call to conduct an Italian mission in Pittsburg coming to him, he gave up the seminary course, and for eight months carried on his mission labours in the Smoky City.

Three Protestant missions, therefore, were conducted by this man, now a leader in a movement which blazons to the world its banners bearing the legend :

"NO GOD, NO MASTER."

In Pittsburg he seems to have come, for the first time, into close contact with the Socialists, and to have espoused their cause. The authorities connected with his mission objected to his rapidly-growing activities in behalf of Socialism. As a consequence he severed his relations with the mission, and in 1911 returned to New York. This is probably the time when he began to drop God out of his programme. There were nights when he slept on a bench in City Hall Park. Then he got work as a bookkeeper, and later was employed on an Italian newspaper, *Il Proletario*, later becoming the editor. His room on West Twenty-Eight Street became a sort of centre of the "intellectuals" of various nationalities, who engaged in radical discussions of religion, art, literature and political economy. Here he met Ettor and others of the Industrial Workers. When the strike was called in the Lawrence mills he had become a full-fledged radical, and was summoned there, his special task being to organise the work of relief for the strikers' families. He declares that the disorder there would never have occurred if the city authorities had not lost their heads completely. "Eight or nine good Irish 'cops' from New York," he says, "would have handled the situation without calling any militia." Journals like the Boston *Transcript*, the Springfield *Republican* and the New York *Journal of Commerce* take much the same view. Says the last-named paper concerning the subsequent trial of the Labour leaders : "In any riot in which weapons are used, either by the rioters or by those trying to suppress the mob, somebody is liable to be killed ; but there was no reason to believe that killing was a deliberate purpose of the leaders, much less that they could be held directly responsible for the accidental shooting of a woman who was among the rioters as an act of murder. Their conviction under the circumstances would have been rank injustice."

The whole course of the authorities in the Lawrence strike is generally condemned in influential papers. The New York *World* seems to voice the general opinion in the following words :—

"Woollen Trust sovereignty in Lawrence committed many outrages and follies during the strike. It needlessly called out the militia. It asked the State's Attorney for a ruling, which he refused, that a speech in Lowell was an interference with military operations in Lawrence. It broke its promise of clemency to men in custody when the strike stopped. It arrested children for preparing to leave town with their parents' consent. Possibly without its knowledge, but in its behalf, dynamite was planted. Of such stupidity was born the arrest of the three men who were yesterday acquitted. Against Ettor and Giovannitti there was no evidence whatever. Their connection with the crime charged was scarcely a question of fact so much as it was a strained interpretation of the law. They had counselled order. They were far away when Anna Lopizzo was killed."

A careful review of the trial is made in *The Survey* (organ until a few days ago of the Russell Sage Foundation) by James P. Heaton. He says that the belief that the charge of murder was "a trumped-up charge," brought as a piece of anti-strike tactics to get Ettor and Giovannitti out of the way, "has been shared by attorney, newspaper-men, ministers and students of public affairs who have followed the proceedings." That the conduct of the trial and its result was a vindication of the probity and judicial acumen of the court was attested by Ettor himself at the conclusion. Even radical papers in Italy, where Giovannitti in the meantime, while in gaol, had been nominated as a member of the Chamber of Deputies, expressed admiration for the court that conducted the case.

For ten months the two men were lodged in gaol, and for a little less than two months the trial was in progress. Thus, says the New York *Call*, a year of their lives was stolen from them and wasted. No statement could be farther from the mark—so far, at least, as Giovannitti is concerned. We do not refer now to what seems to be the fact, that the attorneys for the two men were themselves responsible for the long delay in the trial; but we refer to the more important fact that this gaol experience of Giovannitti's has given to the world one of the greatest poems (perhaps more than one) ever produced in the English language. It challenges comparison with the "Ballad of Reading Gaol," by Wilde, and is fully as vital and soul-stirring as anything Walt Whitman ever produced. "The Walker" is its title, and we gave extracts from it in our November number. It was published in full in the *International Socialist Review*, and the Springfield *Republican* recently reprinted it in part, giving two and a-half columns to it. It is published in book-form. One of these other poems, entitled "The Cage," not yet published, is thought by Giovannitti's friends to surpass "The Walker." He produced at least five prison poems, some of them in rhyme and rhythm, which show many technical defects, some in Whitmanesque style. One of them, on Rodin's statue of The Thinker, has the following stanza, showing how far the author has drifted from former theological moorings :—

Beyond your flesh and mind and blood,
Nothing there is to live or do.
There is no man, there is no God,
There is not anything but you.

"The Walker" is more than a poem. It is a great human document. It begins as follows :—

I hear footsteps over my head all night.
They come and they go. Again they come and again they go all night.
They come one eternity in four paces and they go one eternity in four paces, and between the coming and the going there is Silence and the Night and the Infinite.
For infinite are the nine feet of a prison cell, and endless is the march of him who walks between the yellow brick wall and the red iron gate, thinking things that cannot be chained and cannot be locked, but that wander far away in the sunlit world in their wild pilgrimage after destined goals.
Throughout the restless night I hear the footsteps over my head.
Who walks? I do not know. It is the phantom of the gaol, the sleepless brain, a man, the man, THE WALKER.

Here is another extract equally graphic and poignant :—

Wonderful is the holy wisdom of the gaol that makes all think the same thought. Marvellous is the providence of the law that equalises all even in mind and sentiment. Fallen is the last barrier of privilege, the aristocracy of the intellect. The democracy of reason has levelled all the two hundred minds to the common surface of the same thought.
I, who have never killed, think like the murderer ;
I, who have never stolen, reason like the thief;
I think, reason, wish, hope, doubt, wait like the hired assassin, the embezzler, the forger, the counterfeiter, the incestuous, the raper, the prostitute, the pimp, the drunkard—I—I who used to think of love and life and the flowers and song and beauty and the ideal.
A little key, a little key as little as my little finger, a little key of shiny brass.
All my ideas, my thoughts, my dreams are congealed in a little key of shiny brass.
All my brains, all my soul, all the suddenly surging latent powers of my life are in the pocket of a white-haired man dressed in blue.
He is powerful, great, formidable, the man with the white hair, for he has in his pocket the mighty talisman which makes one man cry and one man pray, and one laugh, and one walk, and all keep awake and think the same maddening thought.

This is the sort of thing that Giovannitti's year in gaol has produced. It was cheap at the price. Both Giovannitti and Ettor spent their time while in confinement in study, the gaoler giving them access to a well-stocked library. Giovannitti began with Taine's "English Literature." Then he took up a popular work on the history of literature in general, in four volumes. Then he began on an annotated edition of Shakespeare, who speedily became his favourite author. He dipped deeply into Carlyle and Balzac, Shelley and Byron, the rebellious note of the two poets being especially admired. Kant's " Critique of Pure Reason" was another work read.

Such is the man we have called a social portent. For it is surely an ominous thing that a young man of good family, well educated, markedly religious by nature, coming to this land in search of freedom and opportunity, actively associated with the Church in its missionary work among the poor, should in a few years be transformed by his experiences into an extreme revolutionary, bitter against authority of all kinds, flouting the Constitution and denying God. If there is such a thing as a social portent, Arturo Giovannitti is one.

Parliamentary Priestcraft

George Lansbury, Ex-M.P.

The Link

PARLIAMENT has broken up for the shortest Christmas holiday of modern times, and we are told that worn-out, weary legislators, exhausted by their incessant toil, are now recuperating ready for a return to the tremendous struggle before the close of the year. This must sound very terrible to the supporters of the hon. and gallant members who believe that work in the House of Commons is hard; as a matter of fact, take out 100 men from the place, and all those who really count would be gone, for the major part of its membership consists of men who simply say ditto, and register the decrees of the tiny minority in each party who dictate policy. Organisation and discipline have reached such a point that the great bulk of the members of Parliament might just as well stay at home and send on their votes; in fact, I marvel why they are ever needed to vote except to keep up the sham and make-believe of democracy, for this is as true of the Labour Party as any other. They meet every Thursday, and solemnly proceed to discuss, but the whole business of Parliament for a week is *discussed* and *settled* in less than two hours, the reason being that in almost every case questions are left to the officers, or the officers recommend a policy which in nearly every case is accepted, as once a man is an officer he is always looked upon as a more important person than any other. It is, of course, the same with any elected person. I can feel that to heaps of my friends I am a different person now I am not an M.P. It is this kind of superstition which is the ruin of modern representative arrangements, and unless we can break it down we can't hope for a democratic State, as we poor mortals will always pose as being at least as wise as people imagine we are. It is really priestcraft over again.

American Press Censorship

The Public, Chicago

Official and judicial censorship of the Press seemed well enough to good people of the smug variety when *The Public* and a few other publications were denouncing official interferences with it. It was applied in some of the most dangerous and drastic forms in the postal service under President Roosevelt's administration, as well as by municipal authorities under police power, and by courts on pretence of punishing contempts. Those instances of autocracy are bearing their natural fruit now. In Idaho a daily newspaper has suppressed a speech by Mr. Roosevelt in fear of the Supreme Court of the State which was punishing its managers for contempt for having said editorially what this suppressed speech said. There are few things more dangerous to liberty than ignoring the first assaults upon it. To muzzle a Goldman or a Harman when they would advocate unpopular doctrines is to lay the foundations for censorship of a Roosevelt when he utters opinions that are popular. To throttle the liberties of speech and press of even the least or the worst among us is to threaten those liberties for even the biggest or the best.

Established 1900

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE

Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Company
GAYLORD WILSHIRE,
Editor.

Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents or One Shilling per year.

38, CLERKENWELL GREEN, E.C.
London

Vol. XVII February, 1913 No. 2

Syndicalism "Popular for the Moment"

IT'S rather amusing to see Harry Quelch, the editor of *Justice*, on the horns of the dilemma of either admitting that Syndicalism exists and is becoming all-powerful in England or declaring that it does not exist at all. Some time ago he usually said both things in the same article, but now he usually admits that it really exists and is growing, although he is sure that is purely ephemeral.

Here is an extract from an article by him in *Justice* of January 11:—

"How great has been our folly and error! And it has all been part of that dry, doctrinaire, formal Marxist dogmatism which has all along rendered us Social-Democrats such objectionable people to get on with, and which all our critics, from Victor Grayson and Russell Smart to G. R. S. Taylor; from Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald to George Simpson (plucked like a brand from the burning by Tom Mann, Guy Bowman and Wilshire!) now unite in condemning.

"Socialism is, therefore, to us still a religion—a scientific religion—to the dogmas of which we hold as firmly as we do to the scientific dogma that the earth revolves round the sun.

"And, just as in the latter case, in spite of the seductions of the flat earth theory, we hold to the dogma of the earth as a sphere, and swear by Copernicus, Galileo and Newton rather than by Joshua and the Prophet Koresh; so, in the former, in spite of the seductions of Syndicalism, or other forms of Group Co-operation, Co-partnership and Communist-Anarchism, or sentimental ideology, we still believe in Materialist Scientific Socialism—the social ownership of all production and of all wealth—and prefer Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Morris, Hyndman, Liebknecht, and Bebel as guides to the more versatile, if more recently inspired, Mann, Bowman and Wilshire!

"Social-Democracy *is still* the only hope of the workers; and the only way thereto is by the conquest of political power. If the workers prefer to waste still more time in exhausting the possibilities of error, so much the worse for them. We Social-Democrats cannot proclaim error to be the truth because for the moment it may be popular."

The point that Quelch always dodges hovers about his definition of such words as "conquest" of political power by that terrible "weapon" the vote. I am eternally asking him and his brethren of like faith: "What are you going to do if the enemy will not get out when you vote him out?" I never get an answer.

Take the present situation of the Democratic Party in Illinois. I quote from *The Public* of Chicago:—

A DANGEROUS SITUATION IN ILLINOIS.

Judge Dunne's election as Governor of Illinois will not be complete until the Legislature canvasses the election returns. The Legislature cannot canvass the election returns until it organises. It will not be organised until a majority of its Lower House members agree upon a Speaker. No party has a majority in the Lower House of the Illinois Legislature. Therefore, Judge Dunne can be kept out of the Governorship and Governor Deneen be continued in that office as long as political crooks, backed by Big Business crooks, are able to prevent a fusion strong enough to elect a Speaker. The reported plan of these crooks is to prevent any such fusion until Dunne bargains with them to their satisfaction. We greatly mistake Judge Dunne if he does not remain out of office as Governor to the end of his term, rather than bargain away his pledges to the people of Illinois.

Now, it must be remembered that the Democrats cast nearly 7,000,000 votes in the last election, and that they elected Wilson President. Yet when it comes to seating their duly-elected Governor of Illinois there are grave doubts as to whether the Republicans will not swindle them out of the fruits of their victory by a technicality. Certainly if the Democrats with all their votes and all their money, and with the Presidency in their hands, cannot seat the duly-elected Governor, then what chance is there for the Socialists with no money and no President at their back?

Of course, I can hardly believe that Judge Dunne will not somehow or other be seated; but, nevertheless, I think the situation has its lesson, and I certainly think that if Dunne were the Socialist candidate instead of the Democratic that he never would have a ghost of a chance of taking the gubernatorial chair of Illinois.

Wilshire may be "recently inspired," but he has not enough inspiration as yet to answer the question he puts to Quelch.

English Walling and His Reasoning

ENGLISH WALLING was one of the very first of the American Socialists to call attention to the rocks in front of the American political movement, and to the importance of Revolutionary Unionism, but he is still one of the "two wing" men who wish to use all the "weapons." The only marked difference between him and, say, Robert Hunter is that Walling would tie up the political wing by making the platform so strictly doctrinaire that there would obviously never be a chance of that majority vote, while Hunter would make it so broad that Roosevelt could run upon it.

Walling has an article in the "New Review" of New York criticising the overtures the American Socialist Party is making to the farmers. He points out that the new farmer plank practically offers every farmer not only the proverbial ten acres and a mule, but a slave to boot, and a first-class white slave at that. In other words, Walling says that the average American farmer has a wage-bill of $225 to $600 per year, which implies one or two hired hands, and he is to be guaranteed to remain in this favoured position by the Socialist Party in exchange for his vote. Walling says that this is no Socialism, and calls on the shades of Karl Marx for help. Perhaps not; but the point is, that unless the Party does make some such promise they will never get the farmer vote, and if they do not get the farmer vote they cannot get their majority. So what are you going to do about it, English Walling? Marx could only vote once even if you brought him back to life.

Walling makes one funny mistake in his criticism of the Socialist Platform. He says: "It mentions as the immediate cause of high prices the Trusts, but does not mention that values of farm lands rose from 1900 to 1910 thirteen million dollars, which was reflected in the doubling of agricultural prices, a far more important element than all the Trusts."

This is putting the cart before the horse. Prices of agricultural produce have risen all over the world, with the result that farming has proved more remunerative, and with the corollary that land pro-

ducing more profit can pay more rent, and therefore has a greater capital value. Crop prices make the price of land go up rather than the rise in price of land making prices advance. Moreover, the advance in agricultural prices is world-wide, occurring in places where Trusts have no conceivable influence. Therefore we must look for a world-wide cause. We find it in the relative decreased cost of production of gold, owing largely to the introduction of the cyanide process.

The Initiative—No Protection to Labour

NO doubt but that the Initiative and Referendum afford a better method for the voters to express themselves on particular issues than does the present corrupt representative system in America. But saying this does not say that there is necessarily any protection of minority rights; it is merely saying that the rights of the majority are protected.

One might think that with organised labour controlling so many votes that when such a vital question as the right to picket in a strike were in question that there would not be much question about the way the popular vote would go. Yet when this very question was voted upon in Oregon the other day there were found 49,826 to vote to make picketing illegal, while 60,560 voted against prohibition. True, the law was defeated; but, all the same, when we see over 40 per cent. of the electorate vote against such a fundamental labour right as that of picketing, it must be acknowledged that a pure democracy is no protection for labour in a community where there is a large middle-class and farmer vote.

The only real protection that labour can have is economic organisation. Let there be economic solidarity, and then 25 per cent. of the electorate could defy any majority to pass any anti-picketing law that would be effective.

The importance of protection of the rights of minorities is just now being lost sight of, inasmuch as the rights of the vast majority are being so heavily trampled upon by a plutocratic minority, and other things being equal, the rights of the majority to receive attention take precedence to the rights of a minority.

In a way, however, protection of minorities is much more important than protection of the majority; for, usually, the majority can take care of itself, whereas the minority often is defenceless.

What will Wilson do to Warren?

MY first experience with the United States Post Office, which is usually the tool used by the Administration when it has dirty work to do, was in Los Angeles.

It was in 1901. I was then publishing *The Challenge*, the predecessor to WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE. An enthusiast writing from Ohio was unable to express all his ideas inside the letter, so he used the addressed side of his envelope as well to illustrate his admiration pictorially. It was an amusing sketch, and I innocently had a half-tone made of it and printed it in the paper. Result: the following week a couple of Post Office sleuths suddenly pounced down on my printing office and made a careful search high and low for the block of that picture. It was not to be found, much to their evident annoyance. Why did they want it? Because in photographing the envelope the cut showed that I had photographed the cancelled U.S. postage stamp. It is a penal offence to make a cut of a United States stamp. Counterfeiting! The Post Office were after that cut to get evidence. It was purely a lucky accident that the cut was not to be found, and to this day is inexplicable. Usually we waited until enough had accumulated and then sold them for old junk.

Of course, it is an old story of how later on the Post Office refused me a transfer of second-class entry for *The Challenge* from Los Angeles to New York, and thus forced me to seek refuge in Canada and publish my newspaper there for over a year. It is also a familiar story of how one department of the Government gave me a patent on the Bishop Creek Mine in the California Forest Reserve after two separate and careful examinations as to its genuineness by Government engineers; and then, how later on the Post Office sent out one of their sleuths to Bishop, an ex-dry goods drummer, to make another scientific examination in order that they might let out to the Press that Wilshire's Mine was "under investigation." A hint to some investors is as good as a lie.

Just now I am safe from U.S. Post Office persecution, my journal being published in England. Some day it may prove a happy event that at least one American Socialist journalist is in a position where he can talk freely and in safety about American institutions.

Fred Warren, of the *Appeal to Reason*, is just now not in my happy position. He is in Girard, Kansas, Free America. What the Taft Administration has resorted to in order to down Warren is almost unbelievable. First they started to put him in gaol because he committed a technical violation of Post Office law by printing a Reward Notice on the outside of his envelopes. Plenty of people had done this before without any notice from the Post Office that it was illegal, but when Warren did it Taft had him arrested at once. Then, when he found out that imprisonment would merely make Warren more popular than ever, he insisted on pardoning him, actually giving as his reason that he did not want to make Warren a martyr. No doubt many men have been pardoned before on this account, but Taft is the first autocrat to be foolish enough to frankly state his reason.

The next move Taft made was to have Warren indicted for telling the truth about the Leavenworth Penitentiary, for the rottenness of which the Taft Administration is entirely responsible. Again in this case the Post Office was called into requisition, and Warren was charged with sending obscene matter through the mails.

As if it were possible to talk about the Leavenworth Penitentiary without being profane as well as obscene.

The trouble with Warren is that he not only told the truth, but he proved it. Taft was forced to dismiss one of his obscene warders. Hence Taft's wrath.

The Des Moines *Daily News* sums up this fight against the *Appeal* thus:—

"A federal court is asked to send to gaol men who made public vile conditions in a public institution—a publicity which resulted in dismissal of the accused official.

"Some people would call that work a genuine public service. But 'the people of the United States,' through their district attorney, are trying to send these editors to prison, branded as felons."

It will be noted that I call Taft personally to account for all this petty tyranny and despotism. Warren keeps harping about an understrapper of Taft's named

Bone, but Bone is merely a willing mucilaginous piece of gristle in Taft's hand. Taft is the man who is responsible for the Warren persecution, and his letter pardoning Warren shows perfectly that he has the whole thing well in mind.

Not only is Taft back of it all, but he is back of the absurd prosecution of Eugene Debs and Warren on that silly charge of subornation or perjury. I think the Socialists and the *Appeal* should make this responsibility of Taft perfectly clear, not in order to fix the matter upon that collapsed political balloon, but in order to fix upon his successor, Woodrow Wilson, the responsibility for the continuance of the persecution.

If Wilson is somewhere near as honourable a man as his friends think he is, and even as I think he may be, he will order the whole proceedings against Warren and Debs quashed the moment he is seated in the Presidential chair.

The Future of the Intellectuals

IT is charged by those enamoured with the political fetish that the Syndicalists are merely impatient at the prospect of waiting for a majority vote, and that they are therefore proposing a short cut via Direct Action. Not true. For, as a matter of fact, from the point of view of reason, without experience as a guide, one might readily conclude that political action offered a much shorter cut to Socialism than economic action. Experience, however, shows that it is extremely difficult to get the workers to vote for Socialism. It may, however, be admitted that in the United States it will be a comparatively simple matter in the course of time to increase the present Socialist vote of over 900,000 to, say, 3,000,000, or even 4,000,000, out of an electorate of 16,000,000; it will be almost hopeless to get it much above the 5,000,000 flood-mark, since that marks about the limit. It will be easier to rise from a million votes to four millions than it will be to rise from four millions to five millions, because we will have then approached the margin of political cultivation. True, 5,000,000 is a great many votes, but it is no majority vote. It is not even a plurality vote large enough to elect when there are three candidates in the field. It may be remarked, however, that when the Socialist Party polls five million votes there will be no split in the capitalist vote. No Socialist candidate will ever slip in owing to a division among the capitalists; and, moreover, if he should happen to do so, he would never be seated. For that matter, he would not be allowed to take his seat even if he had a clear majority over all candidates.

But I will admit that on the first blush it seems easier and more logical to try and get the workers to organise to vote than to organise to strike. If there were any short cut it apparently would be by means of voting rather than by striking. While political organisation is slow and difficult, economic organisation is at times, but not always, much more so. In fact, if we did not have the recent experience of what France has done in the way of Syndicalist organisation, of what England has done in its recent general strikes of the miners and of the railway men, and, lastly, of what America did in the Lawrence strike and the Little Falls strike, it would be considerably more difficult to realise and forecast the capacity of the workers to spontaneously organise economically sufficiently well to bring us to Socialism.

Particularly from the point of view of the average middle-class Socialist does it seem much more practical and sensible to advocate something that he himself can assist in, namely, political organisation and voting, rather than something which is largely outside of his orbit and where, as a rule, he can do little effective work, namely, in organising industrial unions. Of course, he cannot strike at all. Hence it is that the so-called "intellectuals," the parlour Socialists, the doctors, the lawyers, the preachers, etc., who are now prominent as "leaders" in the Socialist movement, will be naturally relegated to comparative obscurity in the Syndicalist movement.

However, as the Syndicalist movement succeeds it will, notwithstanding its base being economic rather than political, develop as a bye-product of its success a collateral Socialist political movement. Hence the intellectuals will not be entirely out of a job. It must not be understood that because I look upon the political movement as a powerless movement for any real revolutionary action that I am so partisan that I do not admit and foresee that it is bound to grow stronger and stronger everywhere in the world. But it cannot and will not arouse the old-time enthusiasm it did in the early days of the movement, for it will have been adjudged at its proper value.

Socialism: A Cult or a Power?

"American Socialism of the Present Day," by J. W. Hughan, Ph.D. Pub. by John Lane. 5s.

IN spite of a rather unfortunate introduction by John Spargo, who resembles a Suffragette in insisting upon presenting his own particular opportunistic programme at any and all inopportune times, Miss Hughan has given us a book which should command many readers. Spargo is quite right in saying that the author herself "has been remarkably successful in her attempt to be impartial, although her sympathies are with the Opportunists," but that gives him no call to define a Revolutionist as one "who shouts terrible phrases but declines to participate in the attempt to improve the lot of the workers because the particular measure aimed at will not, of itself, inaugurate the Co-operative Commonwealth." It was evidently the aim of the author to get Revolutionists as well as Opportunists to write something that Revolutionists and Opportunists as well as common ordinary folk might read, and I see no reason why Spargo, in his introduction, should not aid rather than hinder her attempt.

The Revolutionist refuses to be drawn into Spargo's political morass not because he thinks that by sinking himself therein he will not help provide a road for the workers to cross to the Co-operative Commonwealth, but because he thinks that he would be inducing others to follow him uselessly into a bottomless pit. Direct Action forces twenty reforms where political action begs for one.

Miss Hughan's book covers the history of the Socialist movement in America since 1892, when the first Presidential Socialist candidate was put in to nomination. It has considerable historical value from this point of view, but inasmuch as the readers of this Magazine are fairly familiar with all this I will not recapitulate. There is also a good summary of the economic theories held by the leading American Socialists.

She finds that while there is still a general adherence as a matter of form to the theories of Marx, that there is a decided tendency to formulate the policy of the party upon

concrete facts rather than upon abstract theory. Marx can be so twisted and interpreted that I have yet to see any Socialist, Opportunist or Revolutionist, but what could prove that Marx fully endorsed his particular point of view. For my own part I never knowingly got any of my economic views from Marx, as I confess to my shame that I became a Socialist twenty-five years ago before I had even heard his name. Several years later I did struggle through "Capital," but I cannot say that I knew any more after I had finished than when I began. Marx unquestionably was a man of tremendous intellect, but even granting all it is humanly possible to grant about his greatness, I could never be impressed in any degree by a quotation from Marx as I would be by one single fact.

It does not need a gigantic intellect to see that the rich are rich because they own land and capital, and that the workers are poor because they own nothing. Moreover, it does not require much of an intellect to see that if the land and capital were owned and operated by the workers themselves that poverty would be abolished. It is merely a question of how can the workers get the land and the capital away from the rich. Marx certainly explained clearly enough in several very big volumes why the poor are poor, but he never explained his plan of expropriation clearly enough to prevent the present controversy between Revolutionists and Opportunists as to what his ideas were.

The author says "the Marxian weapons are, first, organisation of the workers ; second, the ballot." I won't say that Marx never called the ballot a "weapon," for Marx wrote too much for one to say offhand that he never said anything without a long and careful search. I don't think he was ever so foolish, however. I will, however, venture to say on my own account that the ballot is about as much of a weapon as a popgun is a Creusot gun. True, the ballot gives Labour an opportunity to express its injured feelings ; but what of it? A pig can squeal as it is led to the slaughter, but its squealing is no good.

On page 53 the author divides the Socialists into two camps, : Marxists or Revolutionists, those who adhere to the letter of Marx ; and Opportunists, consisting of a band of social reformers who cling to Marx as a Liberal Churchman clings to Calvin." I should say that such a division is rather out of date, or rather that the Revolutionists of to-day are the Direct Actionists who pay little or no attention to Marx or any other economist. Her division, however, is fairly correct if we limit it to the so-called *Political* Revolutionists and Opportunists. No doubt this is what she had in mind.

In discussing various views (page 87) of crises, the author says : "Among present-day Americans to place emphasis upon the over-production explanation are Boudin, La Monte, and Wilshire. The latter has elevated the crisis theory into a cardinal doctrine, and exults in the fact that he predicted the catastrophe of 1907 at least a year in advance, when the general press was loud in its proclamation of prosperity . . . . both he and La Monte are now pointing to the vast military expenditures of the world as an artificial outlet for over-production. The majority of American Socialists are, however, ignoring the special theory of over-production. That these differences of opinion are negligible is indicated by the fact that differing ideas of the crisis correspond to none of the tactical divisions of the party. Ghent and Walling, who represent Opportunist and Revolutionist, have laid aside the Marxian theory in this matter ; while La Monte and Wilshire, whose notions rarely coincide, are its vigorous supporters."

I don't know why the author should say that La Monte and myself rarely agree ; as a matter of fact, we are rarely in disagreement. However, I must admit that Miss Hughan has reminded me, by her quotations, that I do not to-day place the importance upon the crisis that I once did. I now not only think that the expenditure for armaments will hold off the next crisis, but I also think that it will not take many more years of centralisation of wealth to so perfect co-ordination between the masters of capital as to practically prevent any long-continued danger from crisis even if they do appear. I think to-day that the Significance of the Trust is not so much in its forecast of an unemployment problem, but of a vast industrial union of the workers called into being as its reflex. I look for the economic organisation of the workers to be the feature of the Revolution rather than a vast army of unemployed, unorganised, and hence powerless mass of men.

In other words, while in the 19th century the organisation of capital was the thing of paramount interest, in the 20th century it is the organisation of Labour—the economic, not the political, organisation.

As the author points out, 71.6 of the workers of the United States are employed in establishments employing 162 or more employees. In other words, the greater part by far of the workers are employed in establishments where a union is more or less of a natural necessity. What with the interlocking of directorates of the big businesses, as disclosed by the Pujo investigation, and the general concentration of industry, we foresee as a corollary a federation of the various industrial unions of the workers is one of the inevitable protective necessities of the near future. Miss Hughan says the Revisionists, otherwise Opportunists, attack the doctrine of concentration by urging that the growth of corporations is a counter force developing a large number of middle-class folk and promoting the dissemination of income. That is, if there is a tendency to increase the number of small shareholders along with a tendency to increase the growth of the corporations, then there will be a large addition to the number of those who will not be drawn into the ranks of Socialist voters. From the political standpoint, this is of moment ; from the Syndicalist one it is immaterial, inasmuch as these small shareholders are unorganised, and so have no economic importance to back up their votes.

In her chapter upon the woman question, the author quotes introducer Spargo : "Under Socialism the overwhelming majority of Socialists would insist on a certain control over marriage ; there would be a maximum of freedom, but they would still insist upon a minimum of legal control."

It would be very interesting to have Spargo explain exactly how he would go about enforcing his legal minimum. To-day society and the Church taboo adulterers, divorcees, and such like, and some moral States like New York and California even put adulterers in prison. Would the Mrs. Grundys of the Socialist State merely taboo, or would they jail people who might happen to live together or who might refuse to live together in spite of Pope Spargo's commands? No doubt from a vote-getting standpoint this blarney about "legal minimum" of marriage under Socialism is a good fly-catcher, but from a logical standpoint it is buncombe, pure buncombe. The disadvantage of being a politician is that you never dare say what you think. When you abolish private property you naturally abolish any great interest in inheritance, for there will be little to inherit individually.

Marriage to-day is essentially an artificial institution to legalise inheritance. I may add that marriage is one thing and monogamy quite another. Man is, no doubt, normally a monogamist. There will be no need of a "legal minimum" to enforce a natural relationship, and if it is not a natural relationship then no law can effectively enforce it.

Spargo is later on quoted as being against the restriction of Oriental immigration to the United States. "He declared that the exclusion of these workers would avail nothing [to restrict competition with the American workers.—G. W.] since there could be no exclusion of the *product* of Oriental labour from the world market." I must say I cannot follow Spargo in this reasoning any better than I can on his "legal minimum." If the rug-worker in America can by a restrictive law keep out a Japanese worker who would otherwise compete for his job, I cannot see that he will lose ultimately just as much

through the Japanese worker making his rug in Japan and sending it into the world market; not as long as the American manufacturer keeps the rug out of the United States by a tariff. The grievance Labour in America has to-day is that there is a tariff on rugs but none on rug-makers. Restriction of Oriental immigration may be against the law of God, and generally unethical from the point of view of Spargo's Nonconformist conscience, but it is certainly of value economically to the American worker. It is merely a question of whether it is better to be unselfish and lay up your treasure in Heaven or be selfish and get more wages here and now in the U.S.A.

I fear that I have introduced too much of controversy into this review of Miss Hughan's valuable book, and it is a lame and ungallant excuse to say that she brought it upon herself by allowing such a controversial introduction.

How Much of a Curse is Whisky?

From a review of Karl Pearson's Investigations, by A. J. Nock *(The American Magazine)*

OF all things that we have been accustomed to assume as likely, one of the foremost is that parental drinking weakens children's wits.

But it was distinctly untrue of these English school-children; so very untrue, in fact, that there is a slight balance the other way. The returns show that there were born to drinking fathers 34 per cent. of defective sons and 30 per cent. of defective daughters; to drinking mothers, 40 per cent. of defective sons and 24 per cent. of defective daughters. While there were born to sober fathers 41 per cent. of defective sons and 31 per cent. of defective daughters; to sober mothers, 39 per cent. of defective sons and 30 per cent. of defective daughters.

Regarding eyesight. The children were examined for normal vision, short and far sight, and three varieties of astigmatism. The fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters were all considered separately. I omit the tables to save space; but their summary shows two remarkable facts:—

(1) The larger proportion of normal eyes is found among the children of drinking parents.

(2) The larger proportion of hypermetropia, myopia, mixed and myopic astigmatism, is found among the childen of sober parents.

An analysis of the tables themselves reveals no correlation between parental drinking and bad eyesight in the child. If anything, it is the other way: the children of drinking parents have the better eyesight.

This discovery reminded the Galton Laboratory of another curious thing. In a previous investigation of other matters, the Laboratory had noticed a similar slight correlation between normal eyesight and bad social conditions. Where, for instance, you found bad housing, congestion, or parents of depraved morals, you were apt to find it associated with good eyesight in the children. It occurred to the Laboratory that the cause was probably the same in both cases—namely, that the child spent more time outdoors. Bad living-conditions tend to drive out children, and so do drunken parents.

So the Laboratory set out to find the correlation (1) between parental drinking and how the child spent its spare time, and (2) between the child's vision and how it spent its spare time. The result showed a considerable connection between parental drinking and time spent in the streets, especially where the parent who drank was the mother. In that case it was made clear, as one would suspect, that the mother's drink was more likely to drive out the child, and that more boys were driven out than girls.

The correlation that was found between the eyesight of a child and where it spent its time brought out a curious result. The largest percentage of normal eyes was found to be among those who spent their spare time in the street. This is as we should expect. The next largest, however, was not among those who spent their spare time partly in the street and partly indoors, as we would suppose, but those who spent it practically all indoors. The reason for this has not been determined. All that can be said is that greater time in the street for either boys or girls does not appear to be continuously associated with better eyesight, either as regards acuity of vision or correct refraction—the test being made for each, and the correlation for each being separately computed.

Finally, although tables do not much adorn a page, the table showing the correlation between parental drinking and child-mortality must be given. Here the drinking parents were divided into two classes: those who drink regularly, and the "periodicals," as we know them, or those who go on sprees:—

	Father Sober.	Father Drinks.	Father Sprees.
Average size of family	5.99	6.20	6.03
Average number dead children	1.73	1.99	1.97
Net family	4.26	4.21	4.06
Death-rate, per cent.	28.9	32.1	32.7
	Mother Sober.	**Mother Drinks.**	**Mother Sprees.**
Average size of family	5.91	6.25	6.32
Average number dead children	1.68	2.09	2.28
Net family	4.23	4.16	4.04
Death-rate, per cent.	28.4	33.4	36.1

It will be seen that the death-rate is higher when the mother drinks than when the father drinks. It is possible that this may indicate some toxic effect. But noting the especially high death-rate where the mother is a "periodical," it might more reasonably be inferred that when the mother drinks a large number of deaths may be due to carelessness or misadventure.

Another common error is indicated in this table; namely, that the population would increase much faster were it not for the child-mortality due to alcohol. The relative size of the *net* family goes to show that the abolition of alcohol would not make a difference of 1 per cent. in the increase of the population.

Professor Pearson sums up the results of the investigation by saying that "no marked relation of any kind has been found between intelligence, physique, or disease of the offspring and parental alcoholism, in any of the categories investigated." This conclusion, I repeat, is not final. Finality, in a matter of this kind, is an affair of many years and much research. But as far as the investigation has gone it is dependable; and Professor Pearson, who invariably speaks with the reverent caution of a true man of science, goes so far as to say that nothing in sight at present seems likely to modify it.

It is a startling conclusion, especially to those trained, as I was, to believe otherwise. To some it may be unwelcome and shocking. It may make upon them the painful impression of an attempt to whittle down the seriousness of the problem of drink.

But truth, if one is but willing to trust it, is never found unfriendly to a good cause. If Professor Pearson's conclusions are finally proved beyond question, the cause of reform will not be weakened but strengthened. The moral burden of responsibility for this national evil will be increased, not lightened. Seen by this new light, the problem will no doubt show many aspects of difference from our present apprehension of it, but all its seriousness and all its insistency will still be there; nay, in fact, they will be redoubled.

We now think of alcoholism as a habit that a young man slips into largely because he gets into the way of bad company and saloons are handy—something, at all events, largely self-cultivated. We hold our social responsibility commensurate merely with the saloon-facilities we offer him, and conceive that this collective responsibility ends with the closing of the saloon. This is about our conception of temperance reform at the present time.

But if Professor Pearson's conclusions are correct, this conception is inadequate. No doubt, a man will not become a drunkard if he can get nothing to be drunk with; but merely keeping him sober does not solve, nor even touch, our real social problem.

Because, according to Professor Pearson, alcoholism is a *symptom*—a symptom of a defective stock. In his scientific language, it is a "somatic mark of a defective germ-plasm in the stock." The disorder then reaches far beyond the individual case; and keeping the man sober by mere mechanical means does not remedy it. He is prevented, certainly, from degenerating into a certain definite type of nuisance; but while that is something, in view of the real problem it is very little. Such treatment merely amounts to suppressing some outward and visible signs of his disorder, but it does not even approach the root of the disorder itself.

Here is a signboard pointing to the maelstrom of error that has sucked in many a statistician—the practice of taking association for causation. Thousands of consumptive parents have consumptive children; therefore, until the germ was caught and detected and the whole theory of the disease revised, we all firmly believed that consumption was inherited. Or, again, when we see a man who drinks and is poor, we infer that he is poor because he drinks. He may be; but, again, he may drink because he is poor.

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press (1912), Limited (T. U. and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.